

Marilyn Zilinski
12720 Yates Street
Broomfield, CO 80020

3634 '99 MAY 19 P1:27

May 12, 1999

Dockets Management Branch
(HFA-305)
Food and Drug Administration
5630 Fishers Lane, Room 1061
Rockville, MD 20852

Dear Sir or Madam:

I have read the docket and appreciate that it is published in full on the web site so that I might have the opportunity to make an informed response.

Enclosed please find the excerpted questions from your web site with my responses.

It is my position that the use of terms such as "cold pasteurization" or "electronic pasteurization" would not be accurate.

For your information, I became aware of this through the Rocky Mountain News.

Very truly,


Marilyn Zilinski

98N 1038

C2195

[Federal Register: February 17, 1999 (Volume 64, Number 31)]
[Proposed Rules]
[Page 7834-7837]
From the Federal Register Online via GPO Access [wais.access.gpo.gov]
[DOCID:fr17fe99-28]

=====

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Food and Drug Administration

21 CFR Part 179

[Docket No. 98N-1038]

Irradiation in the Production, Processing, and Handling of Food

AGENCY: Food and Drug Administration, HHS.

ACTION: Advance notice of proposed rulemaking.

(1) Does the current radiation disclosure statement convey meaningful information to consumers in a truthful and nonmisleading manner? **Yes.**

(2) How do consumers perceive the current radiation disclosure statement--as informational, as a warning, or as something else? **As informational.**

(3) Does the wording of the current radiation disclosure statement cause "inappropriate anxiety" among consumers? What are examples of "inappropriate anxiety"? **No.**

(4) What specific alternate wording for a radiation disclosure statement would convey meaningful information to consumers, in a truthful and nonmisleading manner, and in a more accurate or less threatening way than the current wording?

(5) Would consumers be misled by the absence of a radiation disclosure statement in the labeling of irradiated foods? **Yes.**

Are consumers misled by the presence of such a statement? **No.**

(6) With respect to foods containing irradiated ingredients, are consumers misled by the absence of a radiation disclosure statement? **Yes.**
Would consumers be misled by the presence of such a statement? **No.**

(7) What is the level of direct consumer experience with irradiated foods that are labeled as such?

(8) What is the effect of the current required labeling on the use

of irradiation? Does the current required labeling discourage the use of irradiation?

(9) What do consumers understand to be the effect of irradiation on food? For example, what do consumers understand about the effect of irradiation on the numbers of harmful microorganisms in or on food?

My understanding is that this process is beneficial.

(10) Do consumers readily recognize the radura logo? **I do.**

(11) Do consumers understand the logo to mean that a food has been irradiated? **I do.**

(12) Do consumers perceive the radura logo as informational, as a warning, or as something else? **I understand the logo as informational.**

(13) Should any requirement for a radiation disclosure statement expire at a specified date in the future? **No.**

(14) If so, on what criteria should the expiration be based?

(15) If the expiration of labeling requirements for irradiated foods is to be based on consumer familiarity with the radura logo and understanding of its meaning, what evidence of familiarity and understanding would be sufficient to allow these requirements to expire?

12720 Yates Street
Broomfield, CO 80020-5787

Dockets Management Branch
(HFA-305)
Food and Drug Administration
5630 Fishers Lane, Room 1061
Rockville, MD 20852